IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE K.K.DENESAN

MONDAY, THE 22ND JANUARY 2007 / 2ND MAGHA 1928

WP(C).No. 925 of 2007(I)

PETITIONER:

E.RAGHAVAN,
SENIOR INSPECTOR (RETD)
SOCIETY FOR THE PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO ANIMALS,
KOZHIKODE.

BY ADV. SRI.T.G.RAJENDRAN
SRI.K.PRAVEEN KUMAR

RESPONDENTS:

---

1. STATE OF KERALA, REP. BY SECRETARY
TO GOVT, AGRICULTURE(ANIMAL HUSBANDRY) DEPT,
SECRETARIAT, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

2. THE DIRECTOR OF ANIMAL HUSBANDRY,
ANIMAL HUSBANDRY DEPT, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

3. THE DISTRICT ANIMAL HUSBANDRY OFFICER,
KOZHIKODE.

4. SOCIETY FOR THE PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO
ANIMALS, REP. BY ITS PRESIDENT
(DISTRICT COLLECTOR, KOZHIKODE)
CIVIL STATION, KOZHIKODE.

5. THE CHIEF VETENRY OFFICER,
DISTRICT VETENARY CENTRE,
KOZHIKODE.

6. KOZHIKODE DISTRICT PANCHAYATH
REP,BY ITS SECRETARY, KOZHIKODE.

BY GOVT.PLEADER SRI.BIJOY CHANDRAN

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 22/01/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

K.K.DENESAN, J

W.P.(C)NO. 925 of 2007

Dated this the 22nd day of January, 2007

JUDGMENT

The petitioner had worked as Senior Inspector in the Society for the prevention of cruelty to animals. On attaining the age of 60 years, he retired from service on 30.4.2005. His terminal benefits have not been finally determined nor the amounts due have been fully disbursed. As per Ext.P7 letter, the District Animal Husbandry Officer had directed the Chief Veterinary Officer to make available all benefits due to the petitioner and to forward the salary bill to the Secretary of District Panchayath, Kozhikode for appropriate action. But the matter is delayed for no fault of the petitioner. Hence he has approached this Court.

2. The Government Pleader, on instructions, submits that action has been taken pursuant to Ext.P7. The dearness allowance due to the petitioner from 1.1.2004 to 30.4.2005 have been disbursed on 6.10.2006. Salary arrears from 1.4.2004 to 30.4.2005 also have been disbursed. The benefits other than those shown above, could not be worked out, since the final determination of the entire benefits due to the petitioner is yet to be made.

2. Facts stated above would show that this is a case where this Court shall interfere and fix a time limit to redress the grievance of the petitioner. Accordingly, the writ petition is disposed of directing the respondents to finally determine the service benefits including terminal benefits due to the petitioner, as expeditiously as possible, in any event, within six weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of the judgment. Counsel for the petitioner submits that no information has been received from the petitioner whether the amounts stated to have been sanctioned have, in fact, been paid to him. I make it clear that if the sanctioned amounts have not been disbursed, the same shall be disbursed immediately. The petitioner shall produce a copy of the judgment before respondents 2 and 3 for appropriate action.

K.K.DENESAN, JUDGE

css/